Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)	
Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by)	WT Docket No. 17-79
Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment)	WI Booker (o. 17-7)
)	
)	

COMMENTS OF BOARD OF COUNTY ROAD COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF OAKLAND

Eric S. Wilson Chairman

Dennis G. Kolar Managing Director

Dianne M. Hersey General Counsel

ROAD COMMISSION FOR OAKLAND COUNTY 31001 Lahser Road Beverly Hills, MI 48025 www.rcoc.org

June 15, 2017

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by)	WT Docket No. 17-79
Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment)	
-)	
	j	

COMMENTS OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY ROAD COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF OAKLAND, MICHIGAN

The Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Oakland (the "RCOC"), a Michigan public body corporate, with jurisdiction and control over 2,600 miles of roads in Oakland County, Michigan, files these comments in response to the Federal Communication Commission's (the "Commission") Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Notice of Inquiry in the Matter of Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment ("Proposed Rulemaking").

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The RCOC supports the FCC goal to ensure smooth and rapid deployment of 5G wireless technologies. The FCC has an important role to play in ensuring the smooth and rapid deployment of these technologies and should be commended for seeking to update and improve its rules and practices to help make 5G wireless a reality. RCOC would welcome guidance from the FCC recommending the best practices to achieve a successful and safe deployment of wireless infrastructure. However, the FCC's proposal to "deem granted" any wireless site

applications upon the expiration of a "shot clock" time limit is a cause of great concern to RCOC.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

According to the wireless industry's narrative, the FCC needs to force local governments to act on wireless site applications by implementing strict "shot clocks" and "deemed granted" remedies. This false narrative fails to recognize two important truths: First, that many local communities want improved internet access, and are willing to work with the wireless industry to deploy the necessary infrastructure. Secondly, wireless industry practices are often what cause the barriers to deployment, as demonstrated by recent applications to locate wireless facilities made by Mobilitie, LLC a privately held telecommunications company.

The most effective way to achieve deployment of new wireless technologies is to find solutions that will allow industry and government to work together. RCOC submits it's agreement with a private wireless company as an example of how to promote public-private cooperation, and submits its experience with recent applications from Mobilitie as an example of how the proposed "shot clocks" and "deemed granted" remedy will not advance the goal of wireless deployment.

II. DISCUSSION

A. LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ARE NOT A BARRIER TO WIRELESS DEPLOYMENT

1. RCOC encourages deployment of wireless infrastructure.

Oakland County, home to Automation Alley¹, has 2,000 tech firms with 42,000 jobs in the tech field, which is more than twice the number of any other county in Michigan.²

¹ Automation Alley is Michigan's leading nonprofit technology and manufacturing business association, connecting industry, academia and government to fuel Southeast Michigan's economy and accelerate innovation. Automation Alley focuses its efforts on innovation and technology, entrepreneurship, talent development, defense and

Nearly 100 companies chose to locate in Oakland County in the last ten years, investing over \$586 million and creating more than 10,500 jobs in the community. RCOC has long been a national leader in deploying the latest signal and traffic control technologies, and was one of the first in the country to deploy computerized "smart" traffic signals that monitor traffic flow and automatically adjust traffic signal timing to maximize the efficiency of traffic flow. As a member of the Michigan Connected and Automated Vehicle Working Group, RCOC is on the leading edge of development of driverless vehicle technology, and recognizes the benefits that deploying the next generation of wireless technology will bring to our community. RCOC supports, encourages, and drives the deployment of advanced technologies, including the latest generation of wireless.

2. Deployment of wireless technologies cannot be done at the expense of safety.

While RCOC encourages the deployment of wireless technologies, such deployment must be done in a manner that ensures the safety of motorists, pedestrians, and other users of the public right of way. Safety is the first priority of RCOC, and this focus has created one of the safest road systems in the nation. RCOC's stewardship of the public right of way plays an important role in the safety of its roadways. RCOC must ensure that work in the right of way is performed safely; does not damage the road infrastructure, sidewalks, driveways, or utility infrastructure; and that installations meet engineering standards as well as any other local, state or federal requirements. Road safety must not be considered a secondary function to deployment

international business, providing resources, funding and actionable intelligence to help members grow and prosper in the digital age. https://www.automationalley.com/About/OurCompany.aspx (accessed 6/6/2017)

https://www.oakgov.com/advantageoakland/programs/Pages/tech248.aspx, (accessed 2/14/2017)

⁴ http://www.rcocweb.org/178/FAST-TRAC(accessed 2/22/2017)

⁵ http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdot/Michigan CAV Working Group June 3 2016 528673 7.pdf (accessed 2/22/2017)

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/msp/santilli-presentation_350343_7.pdf (accessed 2/22/2017)

⁷ Id.

of wireless facilities other uses of the public road rights of way. RCOC has long had procedures in place that create a balance between ensuring safety and allowing for the efficient review of applications to locate facilities within the public right of way.

3. RCOC's existing process works.

Applicants that wish to locate facilities in the right of way of a road under the jurisdiction of RCOC must first apply for a permit, by submitting an application and plan sheets depicting the proposed facility. These plans are reviewed by the RCOC Permits Department and inspected in the field to determine if the proposed facility is compliant with the safety and engineering standard contained in the RCOC manual of Permit Specifications and Standards, an excerpt of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

4. RCOC's example of public-private partnership to promote wireless deployment.

The way that RCOC is seeking to promote wireless deployment is to partner with a private company, Neo Networks, Inc., through a nonexclusive master infrastructure agreement, to create a database of RCOC infrastructure, including poles, traffic signals and buildings, that have potential as sites for the collocation of wireless facilities. This database is actively marketed to wireless carriers, which are able to select locations that are best suited to their deployment needs.

The benefits for wireless providers from this agreement are:

- The ability to quickly identify collocation opportunities in areas where they wish to expand coverage;
- A streamlined process for approval of location siting; and
- A clear and predictable fee structure that allows for accurate project cost projections.

The benefits for a local agency of such an agreement are:

5

⁸ RCOC NEO Master Infrastructure Agreement dated July 5, 2016

- A revenue stream that helps to offset costs associated with acquisition and maintenance of rights of way; and
- Compliance with the public disclosure of compensation required by 47 U.S. Code § 253.
 - 5. The FCC should benchmark and promote national examples of partnerships between local agencies and the wireless industry.

The RCOC would welcome information on other mutually beneficial partnerships between public agencies and the wireless industry, or guidance and model practices from the FCC advising on how such partnerships could be created.

- B. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED SHOT CLOCK AND DEEMED GRANTED RULES WOULD LEAD TO NEGATIVE RESULTS
 - 1. Mobilitie's recent applications are an example of how the proposed rules will have negative consequences.

RCOC has recently received applications from Mobilitie, LLC, which is a privately held telecommunications company, to locate wireless infrastructure in road right of way. There were two main concerns raised by the applications that have led to delays in approvals. The first concern is that the applicant, Mobilitie, LLC was not able to demonstrate that it is a public utility eligible have facilities located within the public right of way. Secondly, the applications raised safety concerns due to the 120 ft. height of the proposed facilities. The FCC's proposed rule changes would not resolve these issues, only make it more likely that unsafe facilities like 120 foot poles will be built and that the right of way will become more congested.

2. Uncertainty over whether applicants are public utilities, and therefore able to locate facilities in the public right of way.

The wireless siting applications that RCOC received from Mobilitie asserted that it is a regulated telecommunications company that is allowed access to public road rights of way under

⁹ See http://mobilitie.com/ (Accessed 6/5/2017)

Michigan and Federal law. But Mobilitie did not present facts that would definitively support this assertion. The wireless industry wants to be treated like public utilities, and be allowed put up new cell towers rent free along streets in the public right of way. But unlike electric, gas and cable utilities, it is unclear which companies are legitimate utilities operating in the public interest, and which are private enterprises out to make a fast buck.

RCOC is the trustee of the public road right of way and has an obligation to ensure that it does not become overcrowded and unsafe. Not being able to clearly ascertain whether an applicant is a utility authorized to locate facilities in the right of way constitutes a great burden to the review of applications and an obstacle to wireless deployment.

2. Unsafe 120 foot poles.

Another fact causing significant delay deployment of wireless technology, is that many of Mobilitie's applications were for the installation of 120 foot monopoles, which are well above the usual 40 foot height of common utility and traffic signal poles. *See* Exhibit 2. A pole of this size is more reminiscent of a power transmission or cellular tower, which have fall zones specifically designed for structures of that height. A typical RCOC right of way is full of pedestrian and vehicle traffic, and is usually only 66 feet wide; about half as wide as the height of the proposed monopoles. Poles with a height of 120 feet raise unique safety concerns, and cannot be permitted in the same manner as standard 40 foot poles installations, or typical utility pole-wireless collations.

3. Shot clocks and deemed granted remedies don't address the problem of flawed applications.

The rule changes proposed by the FCC would not have helped facilitate deployment in the case of the Mobilitie applications to the RCOC. The obstacle to deployment was not with the processing of the applications but with the applications themselves. If the proposed rules had been in effect at the time of these applications, the result could have been the deployment of

unsafe poles in the right of way, benefitting no one and likely have led to expensive litigation.

4. Incorporation of response to Mobilitie FCC petition.

The RCOC has previously responded to the Commission's request for comment on a

related matter, the Petition for Declaratory Ruling filed on November 15, 2016 by Mobilitie,

LLC, WT Docket No. 16-421, and RCOC hereby incorporates by reference and resubmits its

comments in that matter.

III. CONCLUSION

Guidance from the FCC to the wireless industry and the governmental entities charged

with jurisdiction over the public right of ways must emphasize cooperative and workable

solutions (such as public-private partnerships as described herein) in lieu of "shot clocks" and

"deemed granted" approaches, which will result in time consuming litigation, which will cause

needless delays and inconsistent rulings for many years.

Respectfully submitted,

Board of County Road Commissioners of the

County of Oakland, Michigan

By: Eric S. Wilson

Its: Chairman

8

EXHIBIT 1

ROAD COMMISSION FOR OAKLAND COUNTY PERMIT RULES, SPECIFICATIONS AND GUIDELINES



ROAD COMMISSION FOR OAKLAND COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CUSTOMER SERVICES
PERMITS DIVISION

2420 PONTIAC LAKE ROAD
WATERFORD, MI 48328

MARCH 14, 2013

ROAD COMMISSION FOR OAKLAND COUNTY PERMIT RULES, SPECIFICATIONS, AND GUIDELINES

March 14, 2013

Department of Customer Services Permits Division

Road Commission for Oakland County

2420 Pontiac Lake Road

Waterford, Michigan 48328

(248) 858-4835

PART 2 - PERMITTING PROCESS

RULE 2.1 AUTHORIZED APPLICANT

Applications for permits may be accepted from Property Owners, the Property Owner's contractor or authorized agent, or from government agencies.

RULE 2.2 APPLICATIONS FOR PERMIT (S)

Applicants shall submit applications for permits in the manner prescribed by, and on the appropriate forms supplied by, the Permits Division, together with the appropriate fees as established by the Board. Application and permit Form #226 is required for Residential Driveways. Form 64A is required for application for permits for any other activity covered under Rule 1.1. Permits for activities covered under Rule 1.1, other than Residential Driveways, are issued on Form 20A. Applicants shall submit with the application plans or drawings satisfactory to the Permits Division containing the information required by Rule 2.3.

RULE 2.3 PLAN REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSED RIGHT-OF-WAY ACTIVITY

With each permit application, Applicant shall submit <u>five (5) sets of plans or drawings for traffic signal permits</u> and <u>three (3) sets of plans or drawings for all other permits</u>, which plans or drawings shall clearly indicate the following features, or such other features as the Permits Division may require to adequately review the proposed work and/or activities for which a permit application is made:

- 2.3.1 Existing road surface, ditches, Right-of-Way and property lines, road appurtenances, medians (if existing) and dimensions thereof, driveways on adjacent property and on property along and opposite the Road Frontage, names of existing and proposed roads, utilities, Sight Distance triangles, and other physical features which may impact the design, approval, and construction of the proposed work. Applicant shall provide a topographic survey for the entire road width and for the length of the project.
- 2.3.2 All buildings, both proposed and existing, appurtenances to any business being conducted, and dimensions thereof, including notations as to present or proposed use of the buildings.
- 2.3.3 Any and all driveways, tapers, right turn lanes, passing lanes, and center lanes for left turns, which are to be constructed, reconstructed, relocated, surfaced, resurfaced, operated, used, or maintained, shall be designed in accordance with Part 6 of these Rules and include the following dimensions and features:
 - (A) Widths of all driveways.
 - (B) Radii of driveway returns and other points of curvature.
 - (C) Driveway grades or profile view of driveway.
 - (D) Angle of the driveway(s) relative to the roadway edge of pavement if not perpendicular.
 - (E) Dimensions of roadside control island, other traffic islands adjacent to the road and traffic control island/islands in the road.
 - (F) Driveway surface material and traffic island surface material.
 - (G) Sight Distance for the approach.
 - (H) Rumble strips.
 - (I) Dimensions of all taper lengths, lane widths and length, length of curb.
 - (J) Cross-section of proposed pavement showing depth and type of material.
- 2.3.4 Distance from existing driveway(s) and proposed driveway(s) to the nearest Intersecting street or cross-road, dimensions to property lines, property lines extended to the road pavement, and buildings and business appurtenances.

- 2.3.5 All roadside features, in addition to driveways, to be constructed within the Right-of-Way including roadside control island, curb, sidewalks, authorized traffic signs, landscaping, and all other roadside features, such as manholes and poles.
- 2.3.6 All existing and proposed underground and overhead public and private utilities, including but not limited to, water main, storm sewer, sanitary sewer, gas main, electric, and fiber optic structures and facilities.
- 2.3.7 Existing and proposed drainage structures, ditches, sewers, and controls shall include:
 - (A) Size and length of culverts, sewer pipe, outlet controls, and/or ditches.
 - (B) Type of culvert, sewer pipe, outlet control, and/or ditch.
 - (C) Grade of culvert, sewer pipe, and/or ditch.
 - (D) Direction of surface water flow on proposed site.
 - (E) Type, size, and location of drainage structures.
 - (F) Retention volume and outlet control calculations.
 - (G) Other hydrologic/hydraulic information as necessary.
- 2.3.8 North directional arrow and scale of drawing.
- 2.3.9 Location map relating the proposed site to Major Roads.
- 2.3.10 All government land comer survey monuments and witnesses located within the project limits.
- 2.3.11 The name, address, and phone number of the individual preparing the plan. When required by law or the R.C.O.C., the seal of the Professional Engineer who prepared the plans along with his/her name, address and phone number must appear on the plan.

RULE 2.4 DESIGN AND PLACEMENT REQUIREMENTS

The design, location, construction, and operation of those activities covered under Rule 1.1 and related construction within the Right-of-Way shall meet requirements of the current M.D.O.T. Standard Specifications for Construction, the Guidelines of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (A.A.S.H.T.O.), the A.D.A., the design standards set forth in these Rules, and any other standards used by the R.C.O.C.

RULE 2.5 CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF PERMITS

All permits issued in accordance with these Rules shall be subject to the following conditions and limitations:

- 2.5.1 The Permit Holder shall abide by the conditions and specifications contained in the permit application, the permit and these Rules.
- 2.5.2 Any activity covered under Rule 1.1 shall be allowed only after an approved permit for that activity has been obtained from the Permits Division. The activity allowed shall only be as described in the approved permit therefor and in the Approved Plans accompanying the permit. The Permit Engineer, Director of the Department of Customer Services or the County Highway Engineer must approve all significant changes in plans and drawings.
- 2.5.3 Prior to commencement of any activity covered by the permit, the Permit Holder must give the Permits Division or its representative at least two (2) days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and Holidays) notice of the date and time of the commencement of the activity.
- 2.5.4 In the event of failure to comply with the terms and conditions of any permit issued in accordance with these Rules or the failure to obtain an appropriate permit, the Permits Division shall have the right, by issuing a

- stop order, to halt the construction or other permitted activity until such time as satisfactory compliance shall have been made.
- 2.5.5 The Permits Division shall at all times have the right to inspect and test any driveway, structure, connection, pathway, etc., constructed within the Right-of-Way, and the Permit Holder shall reimburse the Board for all actual costs associated with any on-the-job inspection or testing which may be required by the R.C.O.C. Such inspection and testing may include, without limitation, inspection of materials, soils, construction methods, compaction, grades, drainage, signing, barricading, maintenance, or other safety precautions that may be necessary in emergencies.
- 2.5.6 If, upon inspection, an activity described in Rule 1.1 is found to be in violation, the Permit Holder shall correct any deficiencies within a period of 30 days, as specified in a notice of violation sent by certified mail to the Permit Holder. The Permit Holder, however, shall immediately correct all dangerous or hazardous conditions. If the Permit Holder fails to make the necessary corrections within the required time period, the Board or its agents may perform the necessary correction(s), with the costs incurred to be reimbursed to the Board by the Permit Holder.
- 2.5.7 If the permitted activity is suspended for any reason, including a dispute between the Permit Holder and the Property Owner, the Permit Holder is responsible for restoring the Right-of-Way and the roadway to a condition acceptable to the R.C.O.C. Restoration shall include paving, stabilization of slopes and ditches, and installation of temporary or permanent drainage facilities or structures. The Permit Holder agrees and understands that the R.C.O.C. will take reasonable actions necessary to ensure safe public travel, preservation of the roadway and drainage, the prevention of soil erosion and sedimentation, and elimination of nuisance to abutting Property Owners. All such costs will be charged to the Permit Holder. If any suspension of work will be protracted, or, will not be completed by the Permit Holder, the Permit Holder shall restore the Right-of-Way to a condition similar to the condition that existed prior to issuance of the permit. Should the Permit Holder fail to restore the Right-of-Way, the R.C.O.C. will notify the Permit Holder and request that the Permit Holder's surety under the bond either complete the work or restore the Right-of-Way.
- 2.5.8 All costs incurred by the Board in obtaining or enforcing compliance with conditions and standards of the permit, failure to obtain a permit, or defective workmanship or materials shall be borne by the Applicant, Permit Holder, or Person undertaking the activity without a permit. The R.C.O.C. may order any Permit Holder who conducts activity in a manner detrimental to the R.C.O.C's statutory obligation of maintaining roads and streets at all times in a reasonably safe and fit condition for the traveling public to cease and desist all activities within the Right-of-Way, other than ordinary public travel. If necessary, additional cash deposits and expense of maintaining a R.C.O.C. inspector (full-time) may be required from the Permit Holder prior to the resumption of any work.
- 2.5.9 During any and all construction, the Permit Holder shall have a copy of the permit and associated Approved Plans available at the site.
- 2.5.10 The Permit Holder shall take, provide, and maintain all necessary precautions to prevent injury or damage to persons and property from activities covered by the permit and shall use warning signs and safety devices which are in accordance with the M.M.U.T.C.D. The Permit Holder shall maintain all activities covered under Rule 1.1 set forth in the permit in a manner so as not to damage, impair, interfere with, or obstruct a public road or create a foreseeable risk of harm to the traveling public. Any Permit Holder who conducts activities in a manner detrimental to the R.C.O.C.'s statutory obligation of maintaining roads and streets at all times in a safe and fit condition for the traveling public will be required to cease all activities within the Right-of-Way, other than ordinary public travel. If necessary, additional cash deposits and expenses of maintaining a R.C.O.C. inspector (full-time) may be required from the Permit Holder prior to the resumption of permitted activities.
- 2.5.11 The Permit Holder shall comply with all applicable OSHA and MIOSHA requirements.
- 2.5.12 The Permit Holder shall surrender the permit, cease activities, and surrender all rights under the permit, whenever notified to do so by the R.C.O.C. or its representative, because of the need to use the area

- covered by the permit, because of noncompliance with any condition or provision of the permit, or for any other reason determined by the R.C.O.C.
- 2.5.13 Drainage from private property shall not be altered to flow into the Right-of-Way or county road drainage system unless approved by the Permits Division. See Rule 5.9 for storm water discharge requirements.
- 2.5.14 The R.C.O.C. makes no warranty either expressed or implied to any Property Owner, the Applicant, the Permit Holder or to any contractor, engineer or surveyor working on their behalf, or to anyone else, as to the suitability of, or condition of, soils and/or ground water that may be encountered during an excavation. Further, the R.C.O.C. makes no warranty as to the suitability of the subsurface for the work or activity proposed.
- 2.5.15 The road surface may not be used for the storage of materials or any other construction purpose without prior approval of the R.C.O.C. Depending on traffic volumes and other conditions, the R.C.O.C. may require the Permit Holder to provide by-pass lanes (either paved or unpaved), may allow one-lane traffic using Traffic Regulators or other traffic control measures, or some combination of the two. Permit Holder shall maintain traffic controls in accordance with Part 3 hereof, "Maintaining Traffic and Traffic Controls," and the M.M.U.T.C.D.
- 2.5.16 The Permit Holder shall remove any and all excavated materials and surplus materials to an area outside of the limits of the Right-of-Way, unless the permit provides the manner of disposal at locations within the Right-of-Way. Excavated material, removed vegetation (including all cuttings, slash and debris) and raw materials or equipment shall not be stockpiled or stored so as to adversely affect the safety of the traveling public. Permit Holder shall be responsible for the proper disposal of, and shall properly dispose of, in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances and codes, any and all excavated and/or surplus materials, including without limitation soils or ground water contaminated by petroleum products or other pollutants, whether or not associated with sites found on a list published under the Michigan Environmental Response Act, being Act 307 of 1982, as amended, or on any other list or reported on appropriate release forms for underground storage tanks. Applicant and Permit Holder shall be responsible for obtaining, and shall obtain, all required federal, state and local permits, including from the county enforcing agency or municipal enforcing agency in accordance with Part 91 of Act 451 of 1994. A permit issued pursuant to these Rules does not authorize any work activity or disposal within wetlands or wetland fringes. The Permit Holder shall not dispose of, or allow the disposal of, any materials into or near any lakes. streams. culverts. drainage ditches, wetlands, flood plains, or any other protected area, without the express permission of the local municipality, the Department of Natural Resources or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, as applicable, or such other applicable governmental authorities, even if the Property Owner thereof agrees to, or requests, such disposal.
- 2.5.17 The Permit Holder shall store all materials far enough away from the road surface so that they are not a hazard to the traveling public. The Permit Holder shall maintain sufficient clear areas on the shoulder that a car can park off the road in an emergency. Materials and equipment shall not block the vision of traffic seeking ingress or egress to or from the road. Only those materials being used in the immediate, on-going permitted activities can be stored in the Right-of-Way. All other materials, equipment, and trailers must be stored in an area outside of the Right-of-Way. Stockpiles may require soil erosion and sediment control measures. The Permit Holder shall ensure that all loading and unloading activities are conducted in a manner that is safe and minimizes congestion and delay to the traveling public, and that proper traffic controls are in place prior to temporary Lane Closures to load or unload materials or equipment. The Permit Holder may close through lanes from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm only to load or unload materials.
- 2.5.18 The Permit Holder shall store and manage all polluting materials, including, but not limited to oil, grease, diesel fuel, and gasoline in compliance with current state and federal rules and regulations, and in such a manner as to contain discharges and spills and avoid contamination of the ground or ground water. The Permit Holder is responsible for cleanup and removal of any contaminated soils.
- 2.5.19 Prior to commencing any work activity, the Permit Holder shall obtain all required soil erosion control permits from the Office of the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner, the local municipality, and/or all

other applicable government agencies. The Permit Holder shall install and maintain all erosion control features shown on the Approved Plans, on the soil erosion and sedimentation control permits, or as may be required during the life of the project. All temporary control measures must be removed prior to final inspection.

- 2.5.20 The Permit Holder shall prevent erosion and sedimentation during any suspension of operations, including disputes between the Applicant and Permit Holder. If the Permit Holder fails to maintain soil erosion or sedimentation control measures, including temporary seeding and mulch, the R.C.O.C. shall have the right to undertake such work at the expense of the Permit Holder.
- 2.5.21 The Permit Holder shall notify the Permits Division in writing of the completion of the permitted activity and request a final inspection. Prior to release of the permit, the Permit Holder shall complete, to the satisfaction of the Permits Division, all work authorized by permit.
- 2.5.22 The Applicant and Permit Holder are responsible for obtaining any other permits and complying with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, rules, regulations, codes and ordinances. These include, but are not limited to, regulation of inland lakes and streams, wetlands, woodlands, flood plains, filling, occupational safety and hours of operation. Issuance of a R.C.O.C. permit does not authorize activities otherwise regulated by federal, state, and local government agencies.
- 2.5.23 The Permit Holder, and <u>not</u> the R.C.O.C., is solely responsible for the correctness and completeness of plans submitted as part of an application for a permit. Any error(s) in the aforementioned plans that become evident after the issuance of a permit and which change the scope of permitted activity is subject to review(s) and may be grounds for revocation of a permit.
- 2.5.24 The R.C.O.C. reserves the right to limit the number of permits issued to a Permit Holder. The number of active permits the Permit Holder has and the available work force will determine the number of permits that can be issued to a Permit Holder; normally this would be two permits. Failure of a Permit Holder to comply with permit provisions on other permits (active or otherwise) shall constitute just cause to delay or refuse issuance of additional permits.
- 2.5.25 The Permit Holder is responsible for maintaining a minimum of one acceptable access to all abutting occupied properties, driveways, and side streets, unless otherwise indicated on the Approved Plans. The Permit Holder is further responsible for obtaining the written permission of owners or occupants of properties that may lose access during excavation or other work activity. The local police, fire, or emergency service agencies shall define acceptable access. The Permit Holder is responsible for providing signing and other improvements necessary to ensure adequate access until the roadway, driveway, or side street is restored. The Permit Holder shall conduct all its permitted activities in such manner as to minimize inconvenience to abutting Property Owners. The R.C.O.C. may restrict the progress of excavation by the Permit Holder based on the rate of roadway and Right-of-Way restoration, including permanent or temporary pavement. The R.C.O.C. may require that excavation be suspended, until satisfactorily backfilling of open trenches or excavations have been completed, and driveways, side streets, and drainage restored.
- 2.5.26 Permit Holder shall conduct all pumping or de-watering activities in compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (N.P.D.E.S.) permits. Permit Holder shall use outlet filters and/or sediment basins to prevent any sediment from reaching roadside ditches, storm sewer inlets, or surface waters. Discharge of water into roadside ditches for extended periods of time is unacceptable. Placement of water discharge lines on or across the surface of the traveled portion of any road is not allowed without advanced written permission from the R.C.O.C. The Permit Holder shall be responsible for all restoration of the road drainage system. If the R.C.O.C. deems it necessary for the Permit Holder to either alter de-watering operations or to cease de-watering operations altogether for public safety, the Permit Holder shall locate all de-watering facilities as far from the road surface as possible. If, due to extenuating circumstances, de-watering facilities are located closer to the road than the back slope of the ditch, the Permit Holder shall place a flashing light at each such location.

- 2.5.27 Normal weight restrictions are in effect at all times, except during the period when reduced seasonal load limitations are in effect. No staging of vehicles or equipment is permitted within the roadway. All vehicles used as part of construction activities shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, codes and regulations governing their operation on public roadways, and Permit Holder shall not utilize any off-road equipment on any county roadway without the prior consent of the R.C.O.C. Permit Holder shall have road cleaning equipment accessible at all times while construction activities are occurring. Permit Holder shall either reduce loads carried on the roadway sufficient to eliminate possible damage to the roadway, or enter into an agreement with the R.C.O.C. to make appropriated repairs of the roadway. In either event, Permit Holder is responsible for restoration of any and all damaged roadway caused by heavy and high volume of truck traffic resulting from its activities in the Right-of-Way. The use of tracked or crawler mounted equipment on road pavements is not permitted, unless specifically authorized in advance in writing by the R.C.O.C. Written authorization for such use will usually require complete replacement or resurfacing of the entire pavement so used.
- 2.5.28 The Permit Holder shall maintain all work areas in the Right-of-Way in a safe, dust free condition until all work activity in a given area, including the hauling of materials, is completed. At a frequency determined by the R.C.O.C., the Permit Holder shall provide adequate and permitted dust control measures on any and all unpaved detours, by-passes, and shoulders used by traffic. The R.C.O.C. will not permit the use of oil, and the Permit Holder shall not use chloride for dust control on paved roadways.
- 2.5.29 If the area disturbed by the work activity is one (1) acre or greater, or within 500 feet of a lake or stream and requires a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (N.P.D.E.S.) permit, the Permit Holder shall notify the Road Commission for Oakland County and provide the name and address of the certified operator.

RULE 2.6 REVIEW OF PERMIT DENIAL OR REQUEST FOR VARIANCE

- 2.6.1 An Applicant wishing a review of a denial of a permit application or a denial of a request for variance from permit specifications, may submit to the Director of the Department of Customer Services a written request for review, stating with specificity the facts in support of the request.
- 2.6.2 Within 30 days of submission of the request, the Director shall either grant the request or forward the request and his recommendation to the County Highway Engineer. The Applicant will be furnished with a copy of the Director's recommendation, and have an opportunity to respond in writing to the recommendation.
- 2.6.3 Within 45 days of submission of the request, the County Highway Engineer shall make a final written determination, either granting or denying the request. The R.C.O.C. shall forward a copy of the determination to the Applicant by first class mail. If the request is denied, the response shall set forth the reasons for denial.
- 2.6.4 Failure of the R.C.O.C. to meet the above time guidelines shall not be construed as an approval of the variance requested or permit denied.

RULE 2.7 INSTALLATIONS WITHOUT PERMIT OR IN NON-COMPLIANCE WITH PERMIT CONDITIONS

- 2.7.1 The Permits Division may issue a written notice of violation for any activity covered under Rule 1.1 which is constructed, installed, or performed in violation of these Rules.
- 2.7.2 The Permits Division may issue a written notice of violation for a driveway constructed in violation of these Rules, unless said driveway was in existence on August 6, 1969, and the use of the land served by said driveway has not changed.
- 2.7.3 The notice of violation shall specify which rules are violated, the correction required, and the time for the correction (not less than 30 days), and the R.C.O.C. shall send the notice by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the Property Owner.

- 2.7.4 If the violation is not corrected in the time required by the notice, the R.C.O.C. may perform, or hire a third party to perform, the necessary corrections, remove changes, and restore the Right-of-Way to its previous condition; and the R.C.O.C. shall invoice the owner for the costs it incurred for such work, including allocated overhead.
- 2.7.5 The procedure of this Rule 2.7 is in addition to, and does not negatively affect, the right of the Permits Division to issue a stop order or of the R.C.O.C. to correct conditions within the Right-of-Way creating hazards to vehicular travel.

RULE 2.8 LIABILITY, INDEMNITY AND INSURANCE

- 2.8.1 Permit Holder is responsible for any and all compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit by its employees, agents, contractors, subcontractors, suppliers, laborers and invitees, and any of their suppliers, laborers, and invitees, and Permit Holder shall be liable for any and all noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the permit by any or all of them and for any and all damages to public or private property and injuries to Person or Persons by any or all of them while engaged in activities within the Right-of-Way subject to the permit. If Applicant and Permit Holder are not the same Person, they shall be jointly and severally liable.
- 2.8.2 Prior to commencing any permitted activity in the Right-of-Way, Permit Holder shall have provided to the Permits Division policy endorsements and certificates of insurance satisfactory to the R.C.O.C. for all permits, excluding Residential Driveway permits, in amounts and coverage's specified by the R.C.O.C. The R.C.O.C. shall be a named certificate holder with the provision that it will be given prior notification of any cancellation or reduction of insurance.

The required insurance policy or policies must be obtained in the name of, and maintained in the name of, the Permit Holder who signed the permit. Variations in the coverage or form of insurance may be reviewed by the R.C.O.C. risk management program coordinator and/or the Legal Department for acceptability. Insurance must be kept in force until the permitted activities are completed, inspected, and approved.

Should insurance coverage be reduced below acceptable coverage or canceled, authorization to continue activity under the permit is suspended, and the R.C.O.C. may take appropriate action to restore or protect the road and appurtenances utilizing any inspection or other fees, security deposits, and Bonds to defray expenses.

2.8.3 Permit applications and permits will contain indemnity and hold harmless provisions satisfactory to the R.C.O.C., which require the signer to indemnify and hold the Board and its employees harmless for any and all claims arising out of, or in connection with, any permitted activities and/or installation and continued existence of any permitted facilities.

RULE 2.9 PERMIT FEES

Prior to issuance of a permit, Applicant shall pay, in the form of a certified check, bank check, or cash, all amounts indicated on the approved application form for the permit fee, permit deposit, estimated inspection fee, signal fee, and pavement striping fee. These amounts may be combined into one certified or bank check.

Personal or corporate checks may be accepted subject to the approval of the Permits Division. No personal checks or corporate checks in excess of \$500 will be accepted.

Inspection fees are estimated and any actual amount over and above the amount estimated, including any costs associated with Work Authorizations, shall be deducted by the R.C.O.C. from the permit deposit. The R.C.O.C. shall bill the Permit Holder for any charges in excess of the permit deposit. The R.C.O.C. shall return to the Permit Holder any unused portion of the permit deposit. The Bond and permit will not be released until such payments are received by the R.C.O.C.

RULE 2.10 SECURITY FOR ROAD RESTORATION

As a condition for obtaining a permit for any activity covered under Rule 1.1, the Permit Holder shall post security in the form of cash, a certified check, irrevocable letter of credit, or Bond to secure the cost of restoring the disturbed portion of Right-of-Way to an acceptable and safe condition as determined by the R.C.O.C. Such cash deposits, certified checks, letters of credit or Bonds are required for all permits issued which would threaten, or otherwise present a potential for surface damages, to the Right-of-Way, and shall provide ready funds or obligations on which the R.C.O.C. can draw if the Permit Holder does not complete in a reasonable time interval the restoration of the Right-of-Way to an acceptable and safe condition as determined by the R.C.O.C. Permit Holders shall provide Bonds on form 75 provided by the Permits Division, or in a form approved by the Legal Department. The Permits Division shall determine the amount of the security required for a particular permit. For clarification of the above Bond requirements or other questions call the Permits Division at (248) 858-4835.

RULE 2.11 REFUNDS OF APPLICATION FEES, PERMIT FEES, DEPOSITS, AND UNUSED BALANCES

Application fees are non-refundable, regardless of whether the application is approved or denied. Permit fees, sign fees, paint fees, and signal fees become non-refundable upon issuance of the permit.

If the activity covered by a permit does not commence, deposits and inspection fees will be refunded to the Permit Holder upon receipt by the R.C.O.C. of a written request from the Permit Holder for the R.C.O.C. to revoke the permit and return the deposit and inspection fees.

If, after completion of the activity covered by the permit, notification of such completion to the R.C.O.C. and final inspection by the R.C.O.C., any unused balances remain for restoration deposits or estimated inspection fees, the R.C.O.C. will issue a refund to the Permit Holder. Sign fees and pavement striping fees are non-refundable if the R.C.O.C. has incurred costs in reliance on the permit issuance, even if the permitted activity did not proceed. Final inspection will not occur until the R.C.O.C. has been satisfied that all repairs have been made, vegetation has been established, and that no settlements will occur.

RULE 2.12 INTERPRETATIONS AND APPROVALS

- 2.12.1 The implementation of, and any variances from, these Rules, and the standards and guidelines cited therein shall be determined in the engineering judgment of the R.C.O.C. All questions which may arise as to the quality and acceptability of work; the manner of performance and rate of progress of the work; the interpretation of designs, specifications, these Rules and the permit terms conditions; and the satisfactory and acceptable fulfillment of the permit terms and conditions shall be decided by the R.C.O.C.
- 2.12.2 Approvals, reviews and inspections of any nature by the R.C.O.C., shall not be construed as a warranty or assumption of liability on the part of the R.C.O.C. All such approvals, reviews, and inspections are for the sole and exclusive purposes of the R.C.O.C., which is acting in a governmental function; and such approvals, reviews and inspections of the R.C.O.C. shall not relieve the Applicant, the Permit Holder, any contractor or any other Person from his, her or its obligations, nor be construed as a warranty of the propriety of the performance of the Applicant, the Permit Holder, any contractor, or any other Person.

EXHIBIT 2

First Office

Fax or Email Address enelson@mobilitie.com

BUADO DE GUALTE ROLLE COMMINSADARRO, ORIGINARIO COUNTY MICHIGAN

PERMIT ABOUT AND A TRIM MAKE CHECK PAYABLE TO ROAD COMMISSION FOR C					FOR R. 0.0.0, USE 001.7		
		R OAKLAND C	COUNTY	Application it) <u> ' </u>		
				Dals Receive	a <u>13 (</u>		
				Permit E No		The second secon	
				Date of Issua	nce	CAMPAGE ALLERS THE	
				L			
APPLICANT: MOBILITIE, LLC	CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, USE	andler Main	TAIN of to TEMPOR	ADII V CLOSE	A COUNTY PO	hereby make	
·	PINE ROAD	and/or many	INITY OF TO LEINFORD	ANICI CLUSE			
	desired facility and/or activity	in the second	1 :- 16	v(-) - al - b - b - v - v		ediction of the Board	
	ow surface; if parallel to road, in						
	owing must be attached						
	ur route in cases of street clasure			., , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	imiio, apeon	ioquerio dia inamina	
	APPROPRIATE BOX(ES) THAT		E TYPE OF WORKS	YOU WISH TO	DBTAIN A PERM	IIT FOR:	
Annual	- •	_	y (, a, alactric, gas, tel		Sail Boring/Mani		
Approach/Private Roarl Acce		Sanilary/Sto	•	•	VValermain		
Cable TV	Pathway/Sidewalk	Sign/Subdiv	rision Engance Warks	r	Other		
						The state of the s	
Install a proposed transpor	t utility pole in the public rig	ght of way. Pl	ease see attached	Construction	Drawing.		
SITE ID: 9MIX0008888							
COORDINATES: 42.573258	-83,361742						
100000	and the second second second second						
City or Township West Bloc	mfield Township				Section No.	14	
	ad out in accordance with plans,	•	•			* *	
	he above named applicant agree						
•	orion to the stant of any consti		•		• •		
Supplemental specificat	NOMS, on the reverse side, are	ito be incorpo	rated as part of the r	plans or specific	beriups: ancifed	for this proposed work.	
FORRCOI	C. USE ONLY			OR R.C.O.C. US	SE ONLY		
	3. 302 31131						
Design:	Right-oi-Way.	Application	Fee: \$. Fermit F	9 0.	\$	
			2.1	:ficogeO		\$	
		Receipt No:		Estimate	d Inspection Fee	\$	
Traffic:	Maintenanca:		\	Paint Fe	e:	\$	
	-	Bond.	<u> </u>	Sign Fee	· .	5	
_		(RCGC Form 7)	5)	Signal F		\$	
Planning:	Construction:	!			FEE3 CUE		
			AT i	time of Perm	IT ISSUANCE:	\$	
Subdivision:	n de se septembre de <mark>de de se se se de de</mark> s se se de de se se se de de se se de de se se de de de se se de de de	Denario Crea	urance Required	Mar. Fil	No. 1 ^{mg}		
=	Permits:	1 1	ibility Required	Yas []	No 🗆		
Environmental Concerns:	Permits.	Pontition Cir	many readmine.	Yas []	ио []		
Tois application is approved sub-	ject to CONDITIONS and SUPPL	EMENTAL SD	CIEICATIONS conv	inad on the case	ren sido di bue n		
• •	es not relieve applicant from n lichigan Department of Natural Re		hucane ledonement	DI ATTRES OF T	aw or other pur	inc bodies of agencies	
	ATION EXPIRES IN ONE YEA		MIT HAS NOT REE	W ISSUEDI DI	ESHABIITYAL C	E CHROCHT OF ANS	
	EW FEES AND PERMIT AP						
COME WILL CHANGE MEAN	EA LEE NIM CHIMIC AND					THEY SING WAS TIME.	
		1	WOBILITIE, LLC	••			
REFER ALL IN	QUIRIES TO (248) 858-48	:-	APPLICANT (PRIN) OR 1 YE	PE),		: ;	
·			7 40 12	المستاب المستحر أنمه		74 Nin	
DEPARTMENT OF CUSTOMER SERVICES / PERMITS 2420 PONTIAC LAKE ROAD		ERMITS	UCHATURE CO			SA:E	
		1	ERIK NELSON, Netv	vork Real Esta	te Specialist	· •	
WATER	FORD, MI 48328		PHINTEL HAPED SURAH		*	The state of the s	
			120 S. Riverside Pla	iza, Suite 1800) (31	2) 638-5428	
APPLICATION APPROVED:		_	HPPCICANT'S ALUNESS			THE MUMBER	
Ву:	Date:		Chicago, IL 60606				
-			ui i		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. With	





